

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are pending in the present application. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice to refile. Claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended to clarify the invention that is claimed. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, p. 6, ll. 21-24. Additionally, claims 3 and 5 have been amended so that they now depend from claim 1, as well as to clarify the invention that is claimed. None of the amendments to the claims is intended to narrow the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the claims. Additionally, certain paragraphs of the specification have been amended for grammatical reasons, to correct obvious typographical errors, and to improve readability. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

As a preliminary matter, the drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because “the ‘**decoder**’ as it relates to the claims 4-6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” (Office action, p. 2) (emphasis in original). As applicant has cancelled claim 4, which recites a decoder, and amended claim 5 to replace the term “decoder” with “control signal generator,” as well as to be dependent upon claim 1, the objections to the drawings is moot. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

As a further preliminary matter, “[t]he specification [has been] objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. . . . Correction of the following is required: the ‘**decoder**’ as it relates to the claims 4-6.” (Office action, p. 2). (emphasis in original). As applicant has cancelled claim 4, which recites a decoder, the objection to the specification is moot. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)**

Claims 1-3 have been rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,031,425 (“Hasegawa”) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (Office action, p. 2), and claim 4 has been rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Hasegawa under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Office action, p. 4). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-3, independent claim 1, as amended, recites a phase locked loop circuit that includes, *inter alia*, a voltage controlled oscillator, a prescaler, a program counter, a swallow counter, a controller, and a control signal generator for outputting a control signal to control frequency division of the voltage controlled oscillator by using set points of the prescaler, the swallow counter, and the program counter.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hasegawa does not anticipate or render obvious claim 1. While Hasegawa describes a phase locked loop circuit that includes a voltage controlled oscillator 18, a prescaler 19, a main counter 20, a swallow counter 21, and a controller 22 (*see* col. 3, l. 55 to col. 4, l. 39; and FIG. 4), Hasegawa wholly fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a control signal generator for outputting a control signal to control frequency division of the voltage controlled oscillator by using set points of the prescaler, the swallow counter, and the program counter," as recited by claim 1. Because Hasegawa fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, it follows that claim 1 is neither anticipated by Hasegawa nor rendered obvious over Hasegawa. Consequently, independent claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least this same reason.

Regarding the rejection of claim 4, as applicant has cancelled claim 4 without prejudice to refile, the rejection of claim 4 as allegedly unpatentable over Hasegawa is moot.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits the application as a whole is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience. The examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney with any questions or comments regarding this amendment, or the application as a whole.

Respectfully submitted for,  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

October 26, 2004

By: Marla L. Hudson  
Marla L. Hudson  
Reg. No. 43,680  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402  
(312) 474-6300